REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 and 7-25 remain in the application. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 22-25 stand rejected. Claims 10-21 have been allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 6. Dependent claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form. None of these amendments add new matter.

A telephone interview was held with the Examiner on October 17, 2005, wherein claim 22 was discussed with regard to the Murphy reference, as is described in detail below.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levy (U.S. Pat. No. 5,534,787; hereinafter referred to as "Levy").

Applicants' claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 6. With regard to applicants' claim 6 (now part of claim 1), the Examiner asserts that, ". . .Levy discloses an alignment mechanism (base plate 12), attached to the first PCB (10), for aligning the probe (44 and 46) with respect to said test points (not shown)." *See*, 9/9/2005 Office Action, sec. 2, p. 3. With respect to applicants' claim 7, the Examiner asserts that, ". . .Levy discloses the alignment mechanism (12) comprises a plurality of alignment pins (shaft 30). *See*, 9/9/2005 Office Action, sec. 2, p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Levy discloses a test fixture for use in the testing of integrated circuit devices. The test fixture includes a metal conductive base plate 12 mounted on a printed circuit wiring board 10. An electrically conductive metal floating plate 14 is resiliently biased upward to a normal position that is spaced a short distance above the upper surface of the base plate 12. The floating plate 14 has holes 16 through it which mate with and correspond to holes 40 extending through the base plate 12. *See,* Levy Abstract and FIG. 5. The floating plate 14 is attached to the base plate 12 and

maintained in alignment with the base plate 12 by means of a spring 34 and shoulder bolt assembly 30/32, as shown in FIGS. 3 & 4. *See,* Levy, col. 4, lines 5-16. .

Of note, Levy's base plate 12 does not provide any sort of means for aligning Levy's probe with test points. And, as admitted by the Examiner, Levy does not illustrate any "test points". Nor does Levy disclose how the probe shown in FIG. 3 would be "aligned" with test points. With respect to Levy's "shaft 30", which the Examiner equates with an "alignment pin" of Levy's base plate 12, applicants note that Levy's spring 34 and shoulder bolt assembly 30/32 does not provide any sort of means for aligning Levy's probe with test points. Rather, Levy's spring 34 and shoulder bolt assembly 30/32 only provides a means of aligning different parts of Levy's probe (i.e., the base plate 12 and floating plate 14 *of Levy's probe* are aligned with one another).

Applicants' claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicants' claims 2, 3 and 7 are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from applicants' claim 1.

With regard to applicants' claim 8, the Examiner asserts that, ". . .Levy discloses. . .a mechanism (base plate 12), attached to the first PCB (10), for securing the probe (44 and 46) to said target board." *See*, 9/9/2005 Office Action, sec. 2, p. 3. With respect to applicants' claim 9, the Examiner asserts that, ". . .Levy discloses said mechanism (12) is a plurality of rivets." *See*, 9/9/2005 Office Action, sec. 2, p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Levy never indicates that the base plate 12 is capable of "securing" a probe to a target board. Nor can applicants identify any sort of securing of Levy's probe to the target 50 in FIG. 4. With respect to Levy disclosing a "securing mechanism" that employs "rivets", applicants cannot find any discussion of rivets by Levy. Nor has the Examiner indicated where such discussion/disclosure exists.

Applicants' claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Applicants' claim 9 is believed to be allowable at least for the reason that it depends from applicants' claim 8.

2. Rejection of Claims 22-25 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy (U.S. Pat. No. 5,157,325; hereinafter referred to as "Murphy").

With regard to applicants' claim 22, the Examiner asserts that Murphy teaches, "moving the test probe (20) over the target board (14) to seat an alignment mechanism of the test probe (20) to a corresponding alignment mechanism of the target board (14)[see col. 6, lines 23-29; col. 11, lines 16-32]". *See*, 9/9/2005 Office Action, sec. 3, p. 3. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Murphy discloses a wireless test system for simultaneously performing electrical tests on opposite sides of a printed circuit board. Double-ended pogo pins are utilized to electrically interconnect the top and bottom sides of the board under test to the top and bottom printed circuit interface boards, positioned above and below the board being tested, which are electrically interconnected by a flexible printed circuit ribbon. *See,* Murphy Abstract.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 22 in light of the Murphy reference was discussed with the Examiner in a telephone interview held on October 17, 2005. Specifically, the second limitation of claim 22 was discussed, which recites, ". . . moving the test probe over the target board to seat an alignment mechanism of the test probe to a corresponding alignment mechanism of the target board. . . ,".

In the telephone interview, applicants' representative asserted that 1) Murphy fails to disclose seating "an alignment mechanism of [a] test probe" to a "target board", and 2) Murphy instead teaches the seating of an alignment mechanism of an "upper PCB 26" to a corresponding alignment mechanism of an "upper push-down plate 34". For example, Murphy states that, "[t]he upper printed circuit interface board 26 is secured to the top side of a push-down plate 34, as by screws 36, and the bottom side of the upper interface board 26 has formed thereon a spaced series of test contact points 38 which are horizontally aligned with the upper side test contact points 16 on the printed circuit board 14." *See*, Murphy, col. 6, lines 23-29.

During the Interview, the Examiner agreed with applicants' above position and indicated that claim 22 would likely "overcome" the Murphy reference. The Examiner

further indicated that he would call applicants' representative to schedule an additional telephone interview if his opinion of his grounds of rejection over the Murphy reference changed.

Claim 22 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 23-25 are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from claim 22.

3. Rejection of Claims 4 & 5 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4 & 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (U.S. Pat. No. 5,534,787; hereinafter referred to as "Levy") in view of Holcombe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,609; hereinafter referred to as "Holcombe"). Although the Examiner's explanation of this rejection sometimes makes mention of the "Schmid" patent, applicants believe these references are supposed to be to the "Levy" patent.

Applicants have amended their claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 6. Thus, applicants' claims 4 & 5 now include the limitation of an "alignment mechanism". As discussed in Section 1 of these arguments, Levy's probe is not provided with "an alignment mechanism, attached to the PCB, for aligning the probe with respect to the test points on the target board". Applicants' claims 4 & 5 are therefore believed to be allowable because, 1) they depend from applicants' claim 1, and 2) Holcombe does not disclose that which is missing from Levy.

4 . Conclusion

In light of the above Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By: _____

Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 291-3200